

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 were previously cancelled, and claims 7, 18, 28 and 39 have now been canceled herein. Claims 4-6, 8-17, 19-27, 29-30, 32-38, 40-41, 43-50 and 52-53 have not been changed. Claims 3, 31, 42 and 51 have been amended in minor respects.

Claims 54-66 have been added. The added claims cover subject matter disclosed in the text and drawings of the present application and in the earlier-filed applications on which the present application is based. For example, there is ample support for the "phase compensator ... partial destructive/constructive interference" limitation¹ in claims 58, 62 and 65. In the specification, such support can be found, for example, on page 9 at paragraph [32] ("Energy from splitter 98 is applied to phase compensator 108 to obtain the correct phase relationship between the fields of coils 64, 68. * * *) and on page 9 at paragraph [33] ("The four outputs of the ninety degree elements 104 thus determine relative amplitudes and phases for driving the inputs of coil system 60 with the appropriate power levels and signal phases to provide the most uniform transmit field possible. * * * {T}he voltage level and the phase applied to coils 64, 68 can be adjusted to provide a uniform field."). Although the application omitted explicit mention of the term "partial destructive/constructive interference," the cited

¹ In claim 58, this limitation reads as: "a phase compensator for adjusting the phase relationship of the RF power delivered to the first and second coils to cause partial destructive/constructive interference thereof in the overlap region so that a magnetic field produced thereby in the overlap region is approximately equal to that produced near the center of each of the first and second regions."

passages, particularly in view of Figure 5, unambiguously disclose that function. The term is thus necessarily present in the phase compensator disclosed in the application, and persons skilled in the art would clearly recognize that fact. MPEP §2163.07(a). Consequently, no new matter has been added to the application by this *Response and Amendment*. Procedurally, the amendments herein have been made to comport with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.121.

Furthermore, the new claims do not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Nor are they duplicative of previously presented claims, as they reflect difference in scope and are thereby in accordance with MPEP §706.03(k).

RESPONSE TO DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

To overcome the double patenting rejection over parent U.S. Patent 6,714,013, Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) and the requisite fee.


CONCLUSION

Upon entry of this *Response And Amendment*, the present application will contain sixty (60) claims: nine (9) independent claims and fifty-one (51) dependent claims. From the date of filing of the present application, this represents an addition of nine (9) claims total, three of which are new independent claims.

Response And Amendment
U.S. Application 10/714,509
Attorney Docket: MR/97-001.D.C.C.C1
Page 26 of 26

Given the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action dated 4 November 2004. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this *Response and Amendment*, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


James R. Stevenson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,755

MEDRAD, Inc.
One Medrad Drive
Indianola, PA 15051-0780
TELEPHONE: (412) 767-2400 x3280
FACSIMILE: (412) 767-8899